

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed July 11, 2006, and the Advisory Action mailed October 30, 2006, have been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in response thereto. Claims 1-15 are pending in the application.

Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to even more particularly point out and distinctly claim the present invention. Although the decoders and television adapters of claim 1 were clearly required to be contained within the centralized gateway as shown by the structure of claim 1 which shows the portions of the gateway uniquely indented below the words “wherein said centralized gateway comprises”, the Advisory Action stated that “there is nothing in the claim language that prevents the examiner from interpreting that the television adapters and the plurality of decoders are all housed in the port extender module.” Although claim 1 clearly specified that these elements were part of the centralized gateway, claim 1 has nevertheless been amended to specifically recite within each element of the gateway that such element is “in said centralized gateway.” For example, claim 1 now recites “a plurality of television adapters in said centralized gateway.” Prior to this amendment, claim 14 recited “a first respective television adapter output of said centralized gateway,” which clearly necessitates that the adapter is in the gateway. Nevertheless, claim 14 has been amended to recite that the first and second respective television adapters are in the centralized gateway. Thus, the claim interpretation adopted in the rejections that stated that the television adapters and decoders could be located in the port extenders is untenable.

Claims 1 and 14 have been further amended to recite that the television signals are usable (reproducible) by the televisions without further processing and that the television signals are not processed by the port extender modules. As explained in the specification, the port extender module is a low cost device which handles user control associated with video services to be displayed on the respective television (page 7, lines 8-10). Since television signal processing is not performed in the port extender modules, they

are unlike the set-top box of the prior art. The language of claims 1 and 14 is contrary to the interpretation given to them in the last paragraph of the Advisory Action which interprets the set-top box of Hylton to be a port extender.

The rejection of claims 1-9, 12, and 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton in view of de Hass and further in view of Rakib is respectfully traversed. Hylton requires a set-top box at each television wherein each set-top box includes digital audio/video processing and decoding, NTSC encoding, and RF modulation. Each set-top box must be directly connected with the respective television to decode the video signal provided to that television (i.e., the set-top box in Hylton is in the video signal chain of the respective television). The port extenders recited in claims 1-15 do not carry any audio or video signal and only interact with the television through the centralized gateway (even when the same wires are used to communicate between the gateway and the port extender and between the gateway and the television). The claimed invention does not deliver more than one television signal to any one port extender, and the port extender cannot perform video processing. Moreover, remotely providing separate video signals to separate display devices does not in any way suggest the claimed port extenders or the functions thereof. Since television signals in the claimed invention are transported independently of the user data which selects video feeds, the citations to Hylton and de Hass fail to teach the port extenders. Therefore, claims 1-9, 12, and 13 are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claim 10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton in view of de Hass in view of Rakib, and further in view of Humpleman is respectfully traversed. Humpleman fails to correct for the deficiencies noted above in the combination of Hylton, de Hass, and Rakib. Therefore, claim 10 is likewise allowable.

The rejection of claim 11 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton in view of de Hass in view of Rakib, and further in view of Williams Jr. is respectfully traversed. Williams Jr. fails to correct for the deficiencies noted above in the combination of Hylton, de Hass, and Rakib. Therefore, claim 11 is likewise allowable.

The rejection of claims 14 and 15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton in view of de Hass and further in view of Rakib is respectfully traversed. Claim 14 has been amended as explained above. Consequently, claims 14 and 15 are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above regarding claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, claims 1-15 are now in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Mollon
Mark L. Mollon
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,123

Dated: December 1, 2006
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(734) 542-0900
(734) 542-9569 (fax)